

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

JUNE 27, 2006

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Julie Aitken, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr.(departed at 6:06 p.m.), James Aucamp, Jr., Bob Breslau and Jeff Evans. Also present were Councilmember Susan Starkey (arrived at 6:30 p.m.), Development Services Director Mark Kutney, Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planner David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 9, 2006

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve the minutes of May 9, 2006. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Chair Aitken advised that she had a request to review items 3.3, 3.2 and 3.1 in that order.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to review the items in the aforesaid order. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Modifications

3.3 SPM 5-1-06, Stonebrook Estates, 12885 and 12855 Stonebrook Drive (E)

Neal Kalis, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Upon distributing an aerial printout and an area sketch of the site, Mr. Kalis explained the intent of the project which was to accommodate specific houses on specific lots.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 SP 9-3-04, Summit – Questa Montessori School: Phase II Expansion, 5451 SW 64 Avenue (CF, Commercial Conservation)

Regina Bobo-Jackson, Thomas Plansker, Judy Dempsey and Ilija Moss crop, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report which contained updates on which items had and had not been completed as well as current staff recommendations.

Mr. Breslau observed that 18 items in the staff report had not been completed and, therefore, asked Mr. Abramson if reviewing this project had been premature. Mr. Abramson responded that some items could result in conditions of approval while others may be worked out with the Committee's indulgence. It had been Mr. Evans' understanding that an applicant did not come before the Committee unless the items in the planning report had been addressed. Mr. Abramson replied that this was correct; therefore, Mr. Breslau asked the petitioner if the Committee was to assume that the applicant disagreed with all the recommendations. Mr. Moss crop indicated that there were some issues with which he disagreed.

Mr. Breslau proceeded to review the list with Mr. Moss crop explaining why he agreed or disagreed with the items until all 18 items had been addressed. Two of the items were discussed at length, both pertaining to the roof materials and design. Mr. Moss crop explained that changing from a pitched truss roof to a flat truss to span across the gym was a cost savings due to budget cuts. As a compromise for aesthetics, he offered that the mansard would be made larger. Chair Aitken took issue with the fact that the renderings continued to show a standing metal seam roof. Mr. Moss crop apologized for not having changed the renderings and explained that when the plans had been "value engineered," the changes had been made. Although the elevations did not reflect the changes, they still projected the correct coloring and massing. Mr. Moss crop displayed graphics which showed what existed and what was proposed for the project.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 27, 2006

Vice-Chair Engel expressed that he still had an issue with the emergency vehicle route radius and pointed out the problem on the site plan. Mr. Mossdrop explained that he was told by a Fire Department official that the configuration was acceptable as long as it was not restricted in any way by curbing. Vice-Chair Engel advised that the access road on the adjacent northern property was in need of a lot of repair and paving. He also noted that there were some storage sheds on the property line and Mr. Mossdrop agreed that he would speak with those neighbors in order to find an acceptable solution about removing the sheds and repairing the access road. Ms. Dempsey advised of a written agreement between her property and the northern neighbors; however, she was not aware that they wanted a paved road. She reiterated Mr. Mossdrop's intentions to work with her neighbors.

Vice-Chair Engel advised that along the southeast property line, trees were to be removed in order to accommodate a housing development; therefore, the landscaping would be quite scarce. Mr. Aucamp suggested that a hedge row be planted in that area up to the lake. The petitioner agreed with the recommendation. As there was a problem with dead-end parking which Mr. Engel pointed out on the plans, Mr. Mossdrop agreed to move the access as far to the east as the Code would permit.

Mr. Breslau pointed out to Mr. Mossdrop where the parking plans on page 3 did not match the site plan A-01. Once again pointing to the plans, Mr. Breslau identified where three bollards were needed in order to keep vehicles from backing into a circular drive by the middle school and Mr. Mossdrop agreed.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the mansard roof which was to replace the standing-seam metal roof. As it was not the Committee's preference, they recommended that the mansard be made larger and that the shingles be textured tiles. Mr. Breslau suggested shutters be put on the windows to break up the box shape. Mr. Mossdrop agreed to increase the pitch of the mansard as well and to shorten the windows that had shutters on them. Regarding the rear elevation, it was agreed that the mansard would be continuous, that the windows would match the front by being shortened and shutters added, and that there be some form of relief added to the back of the building whether it be scoring or banding. There was some discussion regarding trusses with a pitch that would go up to the mansard and have guttered downspouts for Mr. Mossdrop to consider.

Mr. Breslau pointed out the following: 1) that the A-06 photometric plan did not match the site plan; 2) there was not a photometric for the new plan; 3) plans showed dry retention and wet retention in an area now designated for parking; and 4) that the main driveway photometric should be a minimum of 3.0 to the "first cut."

Mr. Evans commented on the incompleteness of this project and disliked having to make so many recommendations in redesign. He and Vice-Chair Engel disagreed with Mr. Mossdrop regarding the costs of a pitched roof. Mr. Plansker explained the concerns regarding the span because the roof was over a gymnasium. Mr. Evans, Mr. Aucamp and Vice-Chair Engel indicated that the flat roof was the worst of all and that a 56-foot span was no problem at all with wood trusses. Both Mr. Mossdrop and Mr. Plansker agreed to research the pitched roof recommendation since it was also the preference of Ms. Dempsey and since the Committee members believed it would cost the same. Critiquing continued and Mr. Evans suggested that the dormers used for ventilation purposes have two louvers to avoid water penetration. He recommended banding and color changes to which the petitioner agreed to do.

There was a brief discussion regarding easements and rights-of-way and Ms. Nolan clarified that the property had been platted in 2005 as Summit-Questa. Mr. Abramson explained that a comment from Broward County regarded a deceleration lane off Davie Road which addressed an access point.

Mr. Aucamp asked about wet and dry retention areas. Ms. Bobo-Jackson indicated that they were going through the process with the Central Broward Drainage District to expand the lake and did not intend to provide dry retention at this time.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 27, 2006

In reviewing the landscape plans, Mr. Aucamp made several recommendations regarding the north property line which he pointed out on the plans and Mr. Moss crop indicated he understood.

Chair Aitken recommended where sidewalks needed to be located as well as crosswalks over the road. Ms. Dempsey indicated that she understood where they should be located.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the amount of time necessary for the petitioner to complete the recommendations and return with revised plans which staff would have been able to review.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp to table to August 8, 2006, with the following caveats: 1) address the 18 items indicated in the staff report; 2) address the emergency access, its shape and location, to be sure that it was possible to do what was being shown on the plans; 3) address the landscape plan as well as the relocation plan for trees so that they coordinate; 4) address the landscaping on the southeast corner as well as the north side behind the building and all the exotics that were on the site; 5) plan 3 of 9 did not match the site plan parking lot, it needed to be coordinated; 6) have some sort of restriction to the drive-up to the middle school from the drop-off; 7) move the access point into the new parking lot to lessen the dead end; 8) change the roofing material to a dimensional roof shingle; 9) re-look at the building to try to go back to a slope roof and add banding with color changes on the wall to accent the upper windows around that building; 10) the A-06 photometric plan did not match the site plan and the light levels at the entrance were too low; 11) needed to dimension and label the floor plan; 12) add sidewalks along the main drive coming in and tie into the new school, and add crosswalks in appropriate locations; and 13) add a survey and correct the legal description. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.1 MSP 7-1-05, The Courtyards at Rolling Hills, generally located at the intersection of Rolling Hills Boulevard and Rolling Hills Circle (PRD-6.3) **(tabled from June 13, 2006)**

Tracy Lautenschlager, Midgley Jones, Howard Jablon, Dana Bardfeld, Brian Gotfried, and Lisa Sacks, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson provided an update.

Chair Aitken asked if this item had been reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Board and the Town Council. Mr. Abramson reported that this item had gone through the Planning and Zoning process and depending on the outcome of this meeting, it would be reviewed by Council.

Ms. Lautenschlager provided historical information and indicated the modifications which had been made due to public input from neighbors. Working with elevations, Mr. Jones presented the architectural changes. Vice-Chair Engel commented that the site plan appeared to look like a bunch of Army barracks and that the developer was trying to get ten pounds of potatoes in a five-pound bag.

Mr. Breslau spoke of his personal observations of a very similar development built in Denver, Colorado, which he had an opportunity to explore the previous week. He indicated that he could not support this type of design as it did not function and he found it to be unacceptable as a residential project.

Mr. Evans stated that the overall design was a “very gridded, regimented, and a very compacted community.” He detailed what he believed some of the problems to be with the site plan design and that it fell short of the “new urbanism” concept.

Chair Aitken agreed with the Committee’s appraisal and added what she believed the “new urbanism” concept should have included in the site plan. A discussion ensued regarding the direction of this item. Ms. Lautenschlager spoke of some of the changes that the developer intended to make; however, as the Committee was dissatisfied with the basic site plan, time would be needed to discuss major changes. Chair Aitken indicated that the project posed two serious issues – the first being to buffer the neighbors from the impact of the development, and the second was the concern for the people who had to live in it.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

JUNE 27, 2006

As the appearance of a parking lot was a major concern of the Committee's, Mr. Jones reiterated that each townhouse was specifically designed with a double-car garage and room for two spaces in the driveways besides having designated guest parking spaces. Committee members explained what they perceived to be the major issues for the benefit of the petitioner. Ms. Lautenschlager confirmed that she understood what changes needed to be made in order to meet the Committee's expectations.

Chair Aitken asked if anyone wished to speak on this item.

Lisa Sacks, 3646 Amelia Island Lane, was opposed to having a three-story townhouse "peeking" into her backyard since she had two young daughters who played there.

Dana Bardfeld, 3648 Spanish Oak Point, was opposed because it was not compatible with the surroundings.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to table to July 25, 2006. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Breslau asked if there was any way to empower staff in order to manage that the applicants have met all their site plan criteria prior to presenting their items to this Committee. Mr. Dell responded that the division could make a policy that if the applicant had over five outstanding comments, they would not be able to move forward; although, there was nothing like that stated in the Code. Mr. Breslau indicated that he took issue with the "not addressed" response to the staff's comments. He would rather see that the petitioner accepted or rejected the recommendations. Mr. Abramson advised that there was a section in the Code that required that applicants had to be scheduled for Site Plan within six months after the Development Review Committee unless they requested a two-month extension. He added that if the applicant had not been cooperative, staff did have the discretion to withdraw the application. Mr. Breslau expressed that if comments were simply "not addressed," then those items could simply be tabled in order to allow time for the comments to be addressed. There was no disagreement.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member